

foil (1) comprises on the inner side a layer (1c) having an inner surface to which the inner layer (2) is joined by an adhesive.

⁸ ~~12~~ The barrier casing according to claim ¹ ~~11~~, wherein the impermeable plastic foil (1) comprises at least two foils laminated together and selected from the group consisting of polyethylene foil and polyamide foil.

⁹ ~~14~~ The food barrier casing according to claim ¹ ~~14~~, wherein the impermeable plastic foil (1) comprises two polyethylene foils (1a, 1c) and a polyamide foil (1b) between them, wherein the inner side of the impermeable plastic foil (1) comprises one of the polyethylene foils (1c) extruded on wet which functions as an adhesive for joining the absorbent inner layer (2) subsequently applied.

¹⁰ ~~15~~ The barrier casing according to claim ¹ ~~15~~, wherein the casing encloses a foodstuff selected from the group consisting of cooking sausages, simmering sausages, ham, pickled products, and soft cheeses.--

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 4, 6, 9 and 11-15 are presently pending in the application.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the telephone interviews of October 12, October 19 and October 23, in which the Examiner made several helpful suggestions for placing the application in condition for allowance. The above amendments are intended to address the various issues raised by the Examiner in the above telephone interviews, and the following remarks are intended to summarize the interviews and explain the above amendments.

Claim 1 has been rewritten as new claim 11 to incorporate the first portion of original claim 7 and to make certain other formal changes as discussed below. Claims 5, 7, 8 and 10 have been rewritten as new claims 12-15. These amendments are fully supported by the original claims and the specification. In particular, the new term "laminated" added to claim 13 is supported, for example, at page 3, lines 12-16 and page 4, line 22. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by the above amendments.

In the telephone interview of October 12, the Examiner objected to the term "individual fibers" originally appearing in claim 1 as indefinite. While applicants do not necessarily agree with this objection, this term has been omitted from new independent claim 11.

Second, the Examiner objected to claim 5 as being unnecessarily wordy and confusing with the many uses of the term "inner." Accordingly, claim 5 has been rewritten in a